



UNRISD

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

Transnational Social Policy Development: The Case of Indonesia

Prof. Dr. Alexandra Kaasch, University of Bielefeld

Ass. Prof. Dr. Mulyadi Sumarto, Gadjah Mada University

Dr. Brooke Wilmsen, La Trobe University

Draft paper prepared for the UNRISD Methodology Workshop New Directions in
Social Policy: Alternatives from and for the Global South
15-16 January 2015 Geneva, Switzerland



UNRISD

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) is an autonomous research institute within the UN system that undertakes multidisciplinary research and policy analysis on the social dimensions of contemporary development issues. Through our work we aim to ensure that social equity, inclusion and justice are central to development thinking, policy and practice.

UNRISD, Palais des Nations
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland

Tel: +41 (0)22 9173020
Fax: +41 (0)22 9170650
info@unrisd.org
www.unrisd.org

Copyright © United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

This is not a formal UNRISD publication. The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed studies rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the UNRISD Web site (www.unrisd.org) does not constitute an endorsement by UNRISD of the opinions expressed in them. No publication or distribution of these papers is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use.

Background and Topic

Global inequalities of a multi-faceted nature have been a major concern in global policy debates. The discussion around Piketty's 'Capital in the Twenty-First Century', or questions of appropriate measures to capture inequality at various levels, are only two examples of the wide-spread concern about appropriate ways to move towards a more just world. In this context, social policy research has a key contribution to make. It provides profound knowledge on understanding social inequalities, and offers tools and mechanisms to address such challenges. While social problems and inequalities are now significantly transnational, they are still primarily met by national social policy institutions. Nevertheless, not only the context of national social policy development is now 'global', also appropriate national social policies are subject to global discourses, recommendations, and conditionalities.

The proposed research project intends to undertake a study of global and national perspectives on social policy development in Indonesia, and explore potentially new and transformative social policies that have been used for a number of decades. The case study will make a contribution to (1) our understanding of developing countries' social policy reform processes with a focus on transformative ideas and new directions in social policy; (2) the provision of a normative assessment to the appropriate transnational involvement in national social policy; (3) the analytical approaches used in studying social policy in a developing country context; and (4) comparative analysis of other big emerging economies (e.g. Russia, China, India).

The output, in the sense of lessons for national policy making (particularly in Indonesia and countries with a comparable state of development) will be:

- (1) *for national policy makers*: a better awareness of the risks, as well as the opportunities, arising through engagement in social policies by specific global social policy actors;
- (2) *for the global social policy community*: a 'feedback' to international organizations and other actors involved in the Indonesian social policy development on the applicability of global ideas and models to the national political context;
- (3) *for national and global policy makers in other countries*: to provide an example of how global and national procedures and resources can be usefully combined in the attempt of developing sustainable social policies in developing countries.

Literature Review and Case Selection

This research project approaches social policy development from national and global perspectives. In terms of the national perspective, there is, of course, an important and rich tradition of welfare state analysis within countries, and from an internationally comparative perspective (most prominently the welfare state regimes typology of Gosta Esping-Andersen (1990)). Related to the research proposed here, there is an important weakness, though. The focus of traditional social policy research is, to a large extent, on 'core' OECD countries. These countries are mostly used in welfare state comparisons; and global or multi-level perspectives usually refer merely to the impact of economic globalization on the welfare state, or – in the case of EU countries – on supra-national policy making in the EU context.

Global social policy and governance literature focuses on the influence of 'external' actors on national social policy reform in various contexts and forms. The role of the international financial institutions (World Bank, IMF and regional development banks), alternative ideas disseminated by the 'UN social agencies' (particularly ILO, UNESCO, and WHO), and a vast number of other kinds of actors (including individual entrepreneurs, or 'flexians') have been described and studied for how they shape national social policies (particularly, Deacon et al., 1997; Deacon, 2007; Orenstein, 2008; Yeates, 2008; Kaasch and Martens, forthcoming). In this research project, we also consider the role of national governments of other countries as external actors, for example, Australia; and the role of national development institutions of other countries, such as the German GIZ. Social policy ideas and discourses have emerged in various social policy and connected fields. Due to a number of different shocks and developments, we can now observe how global ideas have increasingly become social. Recent examples include the global

economic and financial crisis that has provoked significant changes in global ideas about pension systems. In this context the ILO's social protection floor initiative has taken shape. More recently, the Ebola crisis highlights the importance of health systems as do the discussions around appropriate future development goals.

'Global impact' on national social policy can emerge in a number of different and at times connected ways. *Global discourses* on national social policies have been shown to have diffused across the world and have been replicated in national political debates through which they found their way into national social security laws (Meyer 2001). They have also been shown to build a global context, which national discourses, for example as a reaction to global economic crisis, relate to (Starke, Kaasch & van Hooren 2013). *International (and supra-national) law*, even if often 'soft law', has had an impact on national social policy making as it has been used by national governments or opposition to push for a particular type of reform with reference to instruments such as OECD rankings, global reports, or other kinds of recommendations by international organizations. *Conditional loans* from international financial institutions, even if often criticized, have had an impact on the reform of social policy institutions. More recently attention has turned to the potentially damaging implications of development aid provided by the BRICS (particularly China and India) without stringent conditionalities for the social sector. The specific processes are most likely to happen in coalitions and alliances with domestic actors which need to be traced carefully in order to capture the process patterns of global, world-regional and national social policies in connection with each other.

In addition, there are particular developments and occurrences of 'social problems' that go beyond national contexts and that generate the redistribution of income, demand regulation at supra-national policy levels, and have provoked claims for global social rights. Migration and remittances are examples for such developments and the emergence of global social policies. Indonesia is a particularly interesting case for a research project on national and global perspectives on social policy development: *First*, Indonesia has been undergoing significant social policy development. Indonesia's welfare regime has shifted from a regime that relied on the community to provide social protection to the poor to the one in which the government is becoming increasingly important (Sumarto 2013). In some literature the former is called productivist (Gough 2004; Holliday 2000) and the latter is a liberal-informal welfare regime (Barrientos 2004; Gough 2004). The growing role of the state is evidenced by the enactment of a national social security system – *system jaminan sosial nasional* (SJSN) law. Such policy reform provides a mandate for the Government of Indonesia (GoI) to provide social protection for the poor (Sumarto 2013).

The motivation for the reform was a World Bank loan provided to assist the GoI during the Asian economic crisis in 1998. A conditionality of that loan was a government funded social safety net (SSN). Between the establishment of a SSN in 1998 and the policy reforms of 2014, social policy existed in a dynamic and contested political environment. For example, when President Yudhoyono (2004-2014) came into office in 2004 he did not support the SJSN law (Sirojudin & Midgley 2012) which had been recently introduced by his political rival, Megawati (2001-2004). However, his position drew serious criticism, protests and political pressure from NGOs, trade unions, and the opposition. Yudhoyono finally conceded and implemented the SJSN Law (Sumarto 2013).

Another controversial action by Yudhoyono was unconditional cash transfers to the poor as compensation for reduction in the fuel subsidy. Attempts to distribute the cash in 2008-2009 were thwarted by politicians, governors, mayors/regents, village heads, and students (Sumarto 2013, 2014). The main reasons for their resistance were the serious conflicts that the cash transfers were causing and the belief that the program was an attempt at political mobilization rather than social protection (Sumarto 2013). To minimize the refusal, the Yudhoyono and Joko Widodo administrations changed the name of the program in 2013 and 2014.

As the government is responsible for administering the scheme and distributing the funds, the community still plays a critical role in the provision of informal social protection. The longest running

such example is *gotong-royong* (mutual assistance) in which community members reciprocally give informal social protection to others (Sumarto 2013). This method thrives even with the states increasing role in the provision of social protection as the major beneficiaries are informal workers who cannot access the state scheme. The second type of non-government welfare provision is provided by religious organizations, i.e. Muslim and Christian/Catholic organizations. Over the last two decades, welfare provision by Muslim organization's has grown significantly. Organizations such as *Rumah Zakat* and *Dompot Duava* provide free education and health services to the poor. *Nahdlatul Ulama*, one of the biggest Muslim organizations, works closely with and receives funding from the international donor agency *Global Fund* to help people living with HIV/Aids obtain special health treatment. Unlike the Muslim organizations, the activities of Christian/Catholic organizations are in decline. Most were established by missionaries during Dutch colonial rule (Midgley, 2014) and typically constructed hospitals and schools to provide health and education services.

The development of modern social policy in Indonesia began during the Soekarno administration, 1945-1966. In 1952 Soekarno initiated healthcare protection for private sector workers and in 1963, social protection for public sector workers. However, due to hyperinflation and economic stagnation faced by the administration (Thee 2010, pp. 1-2), the government could not effectively develop the program. Later these social protections were implemented by the Soeharto government, 1966-1998, but only for public servants and the armed forces (Bender & Knoss 2008; Ramesh 2000). Social protection for formal private sector workers, which included health care, employment accident insurance, death insurance, and a lump sum at retirement (Lloyd Sherlock & Schroder-Butterfill 2008; Ramesh 2000; Tambunan & Purwoko 2002, p. 32) was the responsibility of their employers. The protection of informal workers (about 69.9 percent of population) (ILO & Jamsostek 2010) was left to the community (Sumarto 2013).

After Soeharto in 1998 the GoI began to provide social protection for informal workers. From 1998 to 2004 this took the form of the SSN program which targeted poor households to mitigate the detrimental impacts of economic austerity measures implemented in response to the Asian economic crisis. In 2005, the program was replaced by the poverty reduction program, which the GoI expanded from its five initial sub-programs to more than fifty sub-programs. These programs are managed by a government agency so called *Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan* (TNP2K) which translated as "national team of poverty reduction program acceleration". Such teams are spread across almost all ministries on an ad hoc basis. Each program is controlled by presidential instruction that is renewed annually (Sumarto 2013, 2014). One of the poverty reduction sub-programs is the provision of health insurance for the poor - *jaminan kesehatan masyarakat* (Jamkesmas). This has been permanently instituted under SJSN law. The law mandates the GoI to set up a stable social security system which provides health insurance to the poor. Under this system, the GoI pays the health insurance premium for the poor.

The development of Indonesia's social policy has taken place during a time when the nexus between social policy and economic development has been problematic. Like other South East Asian and East Asian countries, Indonesia has been recognized as a country which is reluctant to spend the government's budget for social protection and thus externalises the burden to the community (Croissant 2004; Gough 2004a). Although the GoI has provided social protection for the poor under the SSN and poverty reduction programs, the public expenditure for the social protection has been still under 2% of GDP (World Bank 2012). The GoI prefers to spend the budget to support economic growth rather than social protection programs. Many studies on welfare regimes (Aspalter 2006; Croissant 2004; Gough 2004a; Holliday 2000; Hort & Kuhnle 2000) in South East and East Asia find that government expenditure on social policy is set with the primary aim of supporting economic development. In this sense, health system, along with education services, serve as social investment (Gough 2001; Wood & Gough 2006). By using the health system as its main form of social investment the implication is that the government's goal is to promote industrialization and high economic growth.

Second, Indonesia experiences high economic growth. Prior to the advent of the Asian economic crisis, Indonesia was considered to be part of 'the East Asian miracle' (Stiglitz 1996, p. 151; Thee 2002, p. 198; 2004, p. 83), achieving high growth rates. It was frequently used by World Bank as an example of a successful client in economic growth (Pincus & Ramli 1998). Following three decades of sustained growth of about 6.7 percent per year from 1966-1996 (Thee 2002) in 30 May 1997, the World Bank published a country report which projected that until 2001, Indonesia was expected to achieve a growth

rate of 7.8 percent (World Bank 1997). Only two months after the publication of the report, however, Indonesia faced a detrimental economic austerity because of the Asian economic crisis (Thee 2004; 2010). The crisis revealed poorly operating banks (Rabasa & Chalk 2001; World Bank 2003). After dealing with the crisis, Indonesia is transitioning from a low income to a middle income country.

Third, Indonesia is one of the biggest developing countries. Based on the national population census conducted by Central Bureau of Statistic in 2010 the Indonesia population was 237,641,326. It has the fourth highest population in the world, behind China, India, and United States of America. The development of Indonesia's social policy has been affected by the intervention of global-financial institutions, regional development bank, bilateral bodies, international non-governmental organizations, and United Nations (UN) agencies. The key actors were international-financial institutions, i.e. the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), with a structural adjustment program (SAP), as a condition to access loans from the World Bank and IMF to respond to the Asian economic crisis. Under the SAP, the GoI carried out a big bang political-economic restructuring (Sumarto 2007, 2013) which included price liberalization, privatization, and political-economic decentralization in a short period. To support the price liberalization and privatization, the World Bank advised the GoI to reduce its fuel subsidy and use that reduction to finance social protection programs for the poor. The social protection has taken shape in an unconditional cash transfer program which provides cash of Rp.100.000 (equals to about 10 USD) for a poor household per month (see Sumarto 2013, 2014).

Since the SAP generated economic shocks, the World Bank directed the GoI to provide SSN for the poor financed by a loan so called Social Safety Net Adjustment Loan (Sumarto 2013). The World Bank and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) played a key role in lending to the GoI for the SSN program (World Bank 2001, 2002, 2003). The SSN, however, was not only intended to mitigate the poor from the economic shocks but also aimed to reduce the potential of political resistance from middle class and minimize the potential for social unrest (Sumarto 2007, 2013; 2014). Starting from the SSN provision, the GoI then developed social protection programs that specifically targeted the poor.

The introduction of SSN took place within the context of not only the Asian economic crisis but also democratization in Indonesia. On May 21 1998 the authoritarian-centralized regime of the Suharto administration which ruled for 32 years collapsed. Fueling its downfall was the regimes failure to overcome the Asian economic crisis it faced a legitimacy crisis (Pepinsky 2009; Robinson & Hadiz 2004), however, the decentralising of SAP also played a part. Under decentralization, local autonomous government, i.e. district administration, had been encouraged to provide education, health, and social protection services for the poor. It was mandated that district government had to allocate 20 percent and 15 percent of the budget for education and health services, respectively. At the same time, the local government had to develop local jamkesmas and other kind of local social protection. However, only a few district governments followed the mandate because most of them earned limited local revenue. Moreover, the mayor who is directly elected by the people at local elections was reluctant to allocate the budget as it was not popular enough to assist in reelection.

The development of the selective social protection program was also assisted by bilateral agencies, i.e. the Australian government. The Australian Government provided financial aid in developing the program particularly for social protection distribution under the poverty reduction program. The aid coming from the government, which is disbursed through the poverty reduction support facility (PRSF), is the most sizable funding for the program (Sumarto 2014). At the same time, the German *Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit* (GIZ) assisted the program. GIZ provides policy advice and financial support in developing social security system which includes healthcare protection (Bender & Knoss 2008).

Besides these global agencies, the International Labour Organization (ILO) and World Health Organization (WHO) as parts of United Nations (UN) organizations also support the development of social protection program. The ILO pressured the GoI to adopt international standards of labor rights such as collective bargaining and bipartite negotiating (Caraway 2004). After the Asian economic crisis,

the GoI has been conducting labor reform through ratifying eight of ILO conventions and using them to regulate labor relations (Rupidara & McGraw 2010). Simultaneously, WHO provides technical and financial supports for the GoI in developing health policy, which covers healthcare protection (WHO 2008). Whilst carrying out the aforementioned activities, some of the global agencies collaborate with each other. ILO for instance, works in cooperation with global-financial and bilateral agencies. 'The ILO, backed up by foreign governments and the international financial institutions, became the international arbiter of labor standards' (Caraway 2004, p. 32) in Indonesia. WHO also worked closely with ILO (WHO 2008) and the World Bank performed together with ADB (World Bank 2003).

Currently, the interaction of the local and the global social policy actors is taking shape in the provisions of technical and financial assistances. In developing conditional cash transfer program – *program keluarga harapan* (PKH), which was initiated in 2007, for instance, the GoI asked for technical assistances from UNICEF and the World Bank, and requested financial support from the Australian Government. In responding to the GoI's demand, the Bank and UNICEF have developed training modules on health, education, nutrition, and child protection targeted for the PKH beneficiaries (PRSF 2014). The Australian Government plays a broader role than those of UNICEF and the World Bank. The PKH is part of poverty reduction programs held by the GoI supported by the Australian Government through the PRSF. The entire technical activities and policy process of the PKH is under a control of the PRSF that works closely with TNP2K.

To understand the global and local social policy processes systematically, the analysis of this study will be structured into three levels, i.e. international, national, and international-national nexus. In the international level, this research will see each global actor's role, the actor's policy process, and the interaction among the actors in the Indonesia's social policy development. In the national level, this study wants to look at the development of social protection programs, national policy process, the dynamics of local responses, and the interaction of national with local actors (e.g. district governments, program beneficiaries). While in the analysis of international-national nexus, this study intends to examine the types of the interrelation between the global and local actors and the consequence of the interaction on the policy development.

Aim of the Study and Key Research Question

Making use of the specific expertise of the three main investigators, we approach the topic from two directions. On the one hand, from a 'bottom-up' perspective, we analyze how social policy development in Indonesia has happened in the context of involvement of multiple external policy actors, such as the World Bank, the IMF, national development institutions (such as German GIZ), national governments (i.e. the Australian government), and so on. On the other hand, from a 'top-down' perspective we aim to compare and relate the actual content and shape of the Indonesian social protection system and reform to the main global ideas and discourses within which most of these actors are engaged. Using such an approach, we will develop ways to understand how different levels of policy making inter-relate, and how ideas from national and global sources and actors come together to shape the path of social policy in developing countries. This will make us understand better what kind of social policy processes at different levels help us to develop appropriate and transformative social policies that suit and are acceptable to developing countries' social problems and situation.

The main research question guiding the project is: How has Indonesian social policy developed from global and national perspectives?

In order to answer that question, the following issues will be studied:

- *National social policy development*: How has Indonesian social policy developed and changed since the 1950s? What are the main characteristics of the reform path? What are the different interests and alliances that shape social policies? To what extent can we talk about new or transformative social policies? How do these social policies relate and link to other policy fields?
- *National and global policy dynamics in shaping social policy ideas*: Which external policy actors have played a role in this development? What were their perspectives, ideas, preferences, or requests? How did external players influence national actors and institutions determining social policies? How did national policy-makers engage with global actors?

- *Impact assessment*: What are the implications of simultaneous conceptualization and policy shaping from national and global levels for social policy development in Indonesia? What kind of conditions need to be met in order to make such transformative social policies sustainable and applicable to national and global contexts?
- *Generalizations*: What do the observed patterns mean for the general social policy reforms in developing countries? How does the Indonesian experience compare? What can we learn, and how can we generalize from the case of Indonesia?

Research Methods

This research is based on a case study which uses a qualitative approach to data analysis. A case study refers to ‘an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident’ (Yin 2003, p. 13). The reason for using this approach is because it enables the researchers to answer the ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions about contemporary events (here the impact of external policy actors on national social policy development) without the need to control behavioral events (Gray 2004; Yin 2003).

We aim to collect data in different ways, particularly in-depth elite interviews, and document and archival recording. Obtaining various data is important to triangulate our data for validation (Gerring 2007; Gray 2004; Gray et al. 2007; Yin 2003). The methodological principle of triangulation, thus employing two or more methods for studying a certain issue, intended to facilitate an analysis by providing checks of the assumptions gained from documents and the interviews vice versa. This generated more reliable conclusions than the use of only one source of data would have.

We will collect and analyze openly accessible documents, including governments documents, reports and project documents by international organizations, and media documents (e.g. relevant newspaper articles; governmental and international organizations’ websites, and so on). A document can include text, audio, and video files (Maietta 2008). The documents that will be recorded are government documents, minutes of government officers’ meetings, previous studies, and online and printed newspaper reports (Yin 2003). The archival materials and documents are very useful to support the analysis of the primary fieldwork data (Yin 2003) and for triangulation of the data obtained from government officers.

In addition, this study will collect primary data by means of expert interviews. The interviews will not only allow the generation of primary data, but also facilitate the researchers to use it as a snowball technique to obtain further data or contacts (interview partners). Expert or *elite interviews* are interviews with people who “are referred to as ‘elite’ if they have knowledge that, for the purposes of a given research project, requires that they be given individualized treatment in an interview”, thus a person’s “elite status depends on their access to information that can help answer a given research question”. According to this specific form, the interviews are little standardised: “In elite interviewing, each respondent is treated differently to the extent that obtaining the information that that individual alone possesses requires unique treatment”. Therefore, we will use semi-structured interviews (Cook 2008) where the researchers have a list of questions that are used as an interview guideline, but this type of interview gives flexibility to the researchers, for example to change the order of questions or to add some new questions. The semi-structured interview allowed for probing of the informant’s perception or opinion when it was needed and to elaborate their answer in detail (Gray 2004).

The *target group* studied for this research project are, on the one hand, staff members of international organisations and other ‘external’ organisations engaging with social policy reform in Indonesia. On the other hand, we will speak with representatives of the GoI, as well as other people informed about, or involved with, social policy - reform in Indonesia. They can be called an “elite” as they possess expert knowledge and have been participating in the political processes around social policy reform in the country. More specifically, we aim to get access to officers of the GoI, mayors/regents, trade union

leaders, leaders of religious organizations, and country-based staff or staff responsible for Indonesia, but based on the headquarters of the World Bank, ADB, ILO, WHO, GIZ, and PRSF in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia. If any interview in Jakarta would not be possible, we will consider telephone/skype/email exchanges, as far as academically reasonable. To arrange interviewees in Jakarta, formal letters will be sent that are signed by the Dean of Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gadjah Mada University, as the institutional host of this research in Indonesia. The letters will formally ask them to participate in the interview. In many cases, formal letters sent by a reputable university, such as Gadjah Mada University, help researchers to gain access to experts.

Given a common bias in part of the related literature concerning “good” and “bad” actors in the field, it is important to keep a researcher’s stance towards the interviewee of “empathetic neutrality” (Quinn Patton 2002). This is meant that the researchers need to be in “a middle ground between becoming too involved, which can cloud judgment, and remaining too distant, which can reduce understanding”.

For reasons of research ethics and confidentiality, this study will ensure the anonymity of participants in any publications resulting from this research. Findings from the project will also be shared directly with the interviewees. At the same time we will provide research participants the opportunity to check any reference or quote to what they say in advance of the publication of a related text.

More concretely, in collecting the data, we are interested in the different perspectives regarding the following questions:

- What should be the focus of social policy in Indonesia?
- What have been the specific solutions found in and for Indonesia to address the country’s specific social problems and situation?
- What is the meaning of social ‘crisis’ policy? How do short- and medium-term crisis measures to address social problems together with the establishment of sustainable, long-term structures of social protection over the life course?
- How are social protection programs developed in both the formal and informal sectors? What are the major driven factors of the development both the formal and informal sectors?
- Considering the Soekarno and the Joko Widodo governments, under which administration did the social protection programs grow most effectively? What are the major factors responsible? Why does this happen?
- How can Indonesia care for the poor and the middle class alike while holding the rich accountable? Or is it something else that really matters?
- Where do important and transformative ideas and moves come from?
- Through what kinds of processes do relevant social policy reforms happen? (do multiple levels play a role here?)
- What kinds of transnational social policies make a difference? (e.g. concepts, programmes, funding, regulation)
- What is appropriate global/world-regional involvement in national social policy making? (e.g. providing ideas, supporting specific processes?)
- What should other (similar) countries learn from Indonesian experiences?

Data Analysis

The data from document and archival recordings will be analysed using qualitative content analysis and interviews will be examined employing cross-thematic and cross-case analysis. Qualitative content analysis has been understood by Mayring as “an approach of empirical, methodologically controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication”, which is particularly useful in a case of understanding national social policy development in a context of global social governance.

The analysis of the primary data resulting from the interviews will be undertaken through preparing and organizing the data (i.e., text data as in transcript, or image data as in photographs), then reducing the data into themes through a process of coding and aggregating the codes, and finally representing the data in figures, tables, or a discussion (Creswell 2007, p. 148). The researchers will examine every piece of information obtained from the interviews. These data will be analysed through thematic analysis, based

on the issues raised in each research question. The researchers will also carry out case analysis on all the cases found in both the national and global aspects of this study.

Intended Output

This study will produce different kinds of outputs:

- Contribute to the thematic papers concerning forms of 'new' social policies and programs as observed in Indonesia (including from a historical perspective), the implementation and institutionalization of social policies (from national and global perspectives), social and economic development outcomes, and issues of inequality and exclusion. We aim to particularly contribute to insights on the scope of policy transfer.
- Contribute to the development of a joint project methodology, particularly on issues of national and global perspectives on national social policy development, and on the basis of comparative and transnational/global social policy research methodology.
- Take part in the project-related workshops and other events, policy dialogues and communication during the whole duration of the project.
- Prepare, disseminate and publish the notes and contributions required for making the project work and generating a set of innovative insights and recommendations on future social policies.

Research Team

The research team consists of three researchers and research assistants to support each of the researchers in preparing fieldwork and publications.

- Assistant Prof. Dr. Mulyadi Sumarto has profound knowledge about social policy development in his home country Indonesia; as well as on the key global social policy actors influential in the country's development process.
- Prof Dr. Alexandra Kaasch has specialized in global social policy and governance, particularly in the role of global social policy actors in the field of health systems.
- Dr. Brooke Wilmsen has worked as a social development specialist with the World Bank in Jakarta, at the Asian Development Bank (working on several health sector development projects) and as a policy advisor for the Victorian government in Australia.

References

- Aspalter, C, 2006, 'The East Asian welfare model' in: *International Journal of Social Welfare* 15, pp. 290–301.
- Barrientos, A 2004, 'Latin America: toward a liberal welfare regime', in I Gough, G Wood, A Barrientos, P Bevan, P Davis, & G Room, *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 121-168
- Bender, K & Knoss, J, 2008 'Social protection reform in Indonesia: in search of universal coverage', in C, Kusel, U, Maenner, & R, Meissner (eds) *The social and ecological market economy: a model for Asian development?* GTZ, Eschborn, pp. 327-338.
- Caraway, TL, 2004, 'Protective Repression, International Pressure, and Institutional Design: Explaining Labor Reform in Indonesia' in: *Studies in Comparative International Development*, Fall 2004, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 28-49.
- Cook, KE, 2008, "In-depth Interview" in: LM, Given, *The Sage Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, Sage, London p. 422-423.
- Creswell, JW, 2007, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*, Sage, London.
- Croissant, A, 2004, 'Changing welfare regimes in East and Southeast Asia: crisis, change and challenge', *Social Policy and Administration*, vol. 38, No. 5. pp. 504-524.
- Deacon, B, 2007, *Global Social Policy and Governance*, Sage Publications, London.
- Deacon, B, Hulse, M & Stubbs, P, 1997, *Global Social Policy: International Organizations and the Future of Welfare*, Sage, London.
- Esping-Andersen, G, 1990, *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Fine, B 2014, The Continuing Enigmas of Social Policy. UNRISD Working Paper 2014-10 (prepared for the UNRISD project on Towards Universal Social Security in Emerging Economies.
[http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/httpNetITFramePDF?ReadForm&parentnid=30B153EE73F52ABFC1257D0200420A61&parentdoctype=paper&netitpath=80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpAuxPages%29/30B153EE73F52ABFC1257D0200420A61/\\$file/Fine.pdf](http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/httpNetITFramePDF?ReadForm&parentnid=30B153EE73F52ABFC1257D0200420A61&parentdoctype=paper&netitpath=80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpAuxPages%29/30B153EE73F52ABFC1257D0200420A61/$file/Fine.pdf)
- Gerring, J, 2007, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gough, 2001, 'Globalization and regional welfare regimes: the East Asian case' in: *Global Social Policy*, Vol. 1(2), pp. 163-189.
- _____, 2004a, 'East Asia: The limits of productivist regimes' in: I, Gough, G, Wood, A, Barrientos, P, Bevan, P, Davis, & G, Room, *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 169-201.
- _____, 2004b, 'Welfare regime in development context: a global and regional analysis' in: I, Gough, G, Wood, A, Barrientos, P, Bevan, P, Davis, & G Room, *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 15-48.
- Gray, DE, 2004, *Doing Research in the Real World*, Sage Publications, London.
- Gray, PS, Williamson, JB, Karp, DA & Dalphin, JR, 2007, *The Research Imagination: An Introduction to Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 28
- Holliday, I, 2000, 'Productivist welfare capitalism: social policy in East Asia' in: *Political Studies*, Vol. 48, pp. 706-723.
- Hort, SEO & Kuhnle, S, 2000, 'The coming of East and South-East Asian welfare states' in: *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 10 (2), pp. 162–184.

- ILO & Jamsostek, 2010, *Social security for informal economy workers in Indonesia: Looking for flexible and highly targeted programs*, The ILO/Jamsostek, Jakarta.
- Kaasch, A and Martens, K (eds), forthcoming, 2015, *Actors and Agency in Global Social Governance*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Lloyd-Sherlock, P & Schröder-Butterfill, E, 2008, 'Social security pension "reforms" in Thailand and Indonesia: unsustainable and unjust' DEV Working Paper 03, School of Development Studies University of East Anglia, Norwich.
- Maietta, RC, 2008, "Computer-assisted data analysis" in: LM Given, *The Sage encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods*, Sage, London, pp.103-107.
- Midgley, J. 2014, *Social development: theory and practice*, Sage, London
- Orenstein, M, 2008, *Privatizing Pensions. The Transnational Campaign for Social Security Reform*, Oxford, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Pepinsky, TB, 2009, *Economic crises and the breakdown of authoritarian regimes: Indonesia and Malaysia in comparative perspective*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Pincus, J & Ramli R, 1998, 'Indonesia: from showcase to basket case' in: *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1998, 22, pp. 723-734.
- PRSF 2014, "Mixed Method Process Monitoring and Evaluation of the Family Development Sessions (FDS) in Indonesia's PKH Program", term of reference for bidding to conduct a monitoring and evaluation of PKH, PRSF, Jakarta
- Quinn Patton, M, 2002, *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*, Sage, Newbury Park.
- Rabasa, A & Chalk, P, 2001, *Indonesia transformation and the stability of Southeast Asia*, Rand, California.
- Ramesh, M, 2000, 'The state and social security in Indonesia and Thailand' in: *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 30:4, pp. 534-546.
- Robinson, R & Hadiz, VR, 2004 *Reorganising power in Indonesia: The politics of oligarchy in an age of markets*, Routledge Curzon, London.
- Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Rupidara, NW & McGraw, P, 2010 'Institutional Change, Continuity and Decoupling in the Indonesian Industrial Relations System' in: *Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.. 52, No. 5, p. 613-630.
- Sirojudin & Midgley 2012 fehlt
- Starke, P., Kaasch, A., Van Hooren, F. (2013): *The Welfare State as Crisis Manager. Responses to Major Economic Crisis in Small Open Economies*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Stiglitz, JE, 1996, 'Some lessons from the East Asian miracle' in: *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 151-77.
- Sumarto, M, 2007, 'Social safety nets and economic transition in indonesia: paradox of social services?', in: *Journal of administration and governance*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- _____, 2013, 'Welfare regime, social conflict, and clientelism in Indonesia', (*Unpublished PhD thesis*), Australian National University, Canberra. 29
- _____, 2014, *Perlindungan Sosial dan Klientelisme: Makna Politik Bantuan Tunai dalam Pemilihan Umum' (Social Protection and Clientelism: the Political Meaning of Cash Transfer Programs in Presidential Elections in Indonesia)*, Gadjah, Mada University Press, Yogyakarta.
- Tambunan, TTH & Purwoko, B, 2002, 'Social Protection in Indonesia' in: E, Adam, M, von Hauff & M, John (eds.), *Social Protection in Southeast and East Asia*, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Singapore, pp. 21-73.

- Thee, KW, 2002, The Soeharto era and after: stability, development, and crisis, 1996-2000, in: H, Dick, VJH, Houben, JT, Linbland & KW Thee, *The emergence of national economy: an economic history of Indonesia, 1800-2000*, Allen and Unwin, Crows Nest.
- _____, 2004, *Pembangunan, kebebasan, dan "mukjizat" Orde Baru: esai-esai*, Penerbit Buku Kompas, Jakarta.
- _____, 2010, 'A brief overview of Growth and poverty in Indonesia during the New Order and after the Asian economic crisis', in: J, Hardjono, N, Akhmadai, & S. Sumarto, eds, *Poverty and social protection in Indonesia*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.
- WHO 2008, *The World Health Report 2008: Primary Health Care Now More Than Ever*. Geneva, WHO.
- WHO 2000, *The World Health Report 2000: Health Systems: Improving Performance*. Geneva, WHO.
- Wood, G & Gough, I, 2006, 'A comparative welfare regime approach to global policy'- in: *World Development Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 10, pp. 1696-1712.
- World Bank, 1997, 'Indonesia: sustaining High growth with equity', Report No. 1 6433-IND, May 30.
- _____, 2001, *Indonesia Poverty Reduction in Indonesia: Constructing a New Strategy*, Report No. 23028-IND, October 29.
- _____, 2002, *Implementation completion report (SCI44710) on a loan in the amount of us\$ 600 million to the Republic of Indonesia for the social safety net adjustment loan*, Report No: 24340, June 2.
- _____, 2003 'Project performance assessment report Indonesia banking reform assistance (Loan No. 4255-IND), Policy Reform Support Loan I (Loan No. No. 4368-IND), Policy Reform Support Loan II (Loan No. 4470-Ind)', Report No. 27177, Operations Evaluation Department, November 4.
- World Bank, 2012a, 'Protecting poor and vulnerable households in Indonesia', The World Bank, Jakarta Office, Jakarta.
- World Health Organization (WHO), 2008, *WHO Country Cooperation Strategy 2007–2011, Indonesia*, WHO Country Office for Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Yeates, N. (ed) 2008, *Understanding Global Social Policy*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Yin, R. K., 2003, *Case study research: Design and method*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.